

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been presented.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview on May 17, 2006. During that interview, the prior art reference to Yura was discussed and the Examiner suggested a claim amendment to further clarify that the only fixing nip is formed by the one-piece nip forming member. The Examiner also indicated that he would consider this after-final amendment to the claims.

Claim 1 was objected to due to an informality. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this objection. Applicants requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yura, U.S. Patent No. 6,795,678. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “a one-piece nip forming member . . . wherein the only fixing nip is formed by the one-piece nip forming member.” Yura fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Yura discloses two fixing nips, L1 and L2. Claim 1 recites that the only fixing nip is forming by a one-piece nip forming member. Since Yura discloses two fixing nips, Yura cannot teach or suggest a one-piece nip forming member wherein the only fixing nip is formed by the one-piece nip forming member.

Claim 11 also recites this feature, and is thus allowable for the same reasons. The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yura. Claims 3, 4 and 9 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies and because Yura fails

to teach or suggest all of the features for which it is cited. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn

Claims 1-5, 10-12 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 7 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,221. Since this rejection is provisional, however, Applicants need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

Claims 1, 2, 10-12 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8-10 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,228. Since this rejection is provisional, however, Applicants need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 10-12, 14 and 15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 10-12 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,244. Since this rejection is provisional, however, Applicants need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,221 in view of Yura. Since this rejection is provisional, however, Applicants need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 9 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6 and 9 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,228 in view of Yura. Since this rejection is provisional, however,


Applicants need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 9 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7 and 12 of co-pending Application No. 10/805,244 in view of Yura. Since this rejection is provisional, however, Applicant need file a terminal disclaimer only when one of these applications issues as a patent and respectfully declines to do so now.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 204552023500.

Dated: May 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Deborah S. Gladstein  
Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753